arXiv:1602.00343v1 [math.NT] 31 Jan 2016

WEAKLY MIXING SETS OF INTEGERS AND POLYNOMIAL EQUATIONS

JAKUB KONIECZNY

Abstract. We investigate polynomial patterns which can be guaranteed to appear in *weakly mixing* sets introduced by introduced by Furstenberg and studied by Fish. In particular, we prove that if $\mathcal{A}$ is a weakly mixing set and $p(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ a polynomial of odd degree with positive leading coefficient, then all sufficiently large integers N can be represented as $N = n_1 + n_2$, where $p(n_1) + m,\ p(n_2) + m \in \mathcal{A}$ for some $m \in \mathcal{A}$.

1. Introduction

It is a fundamental question in additive combinatorics to determine which types of structure are guaranteed to appear in a given set of the integers. We begin with citing the celebrated theorem of Szemerédi [12], whose ergodic theory proof of Furstenberg [7] paved the way to applications of ergodic theory in combinatorial number theory.

Theorem 1.1 (Szemerédi)**.** *Let $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{N}$ be a set with positive upper Banach density. Then, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n,\ n+m,\ n+2m, \dots n+km \in \mathcal{A}$.*

Phrased differently, the theorem asserts that any set of positive density contains arithmetic progressions of arbitrary length. Many generalisations exist of this theorem exist. A theorem of Sárközy [11] (see also [7], [8]) asserts that in sets of positive Banach density one can find patterns such as $n, n+m^2$. In approximately the same time, but different direction, a result of Furstenberg and Katznelson [9] pertains to configurations in higher dimensions, showing that a set $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{N}^r$ of positive Banach density contains the configuration $n + mF$, where $F \subset \mathbb{Z}^r$ is any finite set.

Returning to the polynomial in a single dimension, Bergelson and Leibman [2] were able to improve Sárközy's theorem to several polynomials vanishing at 0. This result was ultimately improved by these authors and Lesigne [3] to deal with intersective families of polynomials. A sequence $p_i(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$, $i \in [r]$ is *intersective* if for any integer k there exists $n_k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $k \mid p_i(n_k)$ for all $i \in [r]$.

Theorem 1.2 (Bergelson, Leibman, Lesigne)**.** *Let $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{N}$ be a set with positive Banach density, and let $p_i \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ be an intersective family of polynomials with $p_i(n) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$. Then, there exists $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $m, m+p_1(n), \dots, m+p_r(n) \in \mathcal{A}$.*

Note that the conclusion of the above theorem fails if p_i are not intersective. Moreover, the offending set $\mathcal{A}$ can be very structured: indeed, an (infinite) arithmetic progression will do.

On the other hand, one expects that more can be proved if $\mathcal{A}$ is forced to be *unstructured*. In the extreme case, when $\mathcal{A}$ is a random set, constructed by declaring $n \in \mathcal{A}$ with a certain probability $p > 0$, independently for all n, then with probability 1, $\mathcal{A}$ will contain many occurrences of the pattern, say, $m, m + p_1(n), m + p_2(n), \dots, m + p_r(n)$ for any polynomials (or, for that matter, any functions $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_r$). Thus, it is of interest to see which notions of pseudo-randomness guarantee existence of various patterns.

The class of *weakly-mixing* sets was proposed by Furstenberg and investigated by Fish [5], [6]. Roughly speaking, a weakly mixing set is a set of return times of a generic point to an open neighbourhood of its origin in a weakly-mixing measure preserving system $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{A}}$. While the precise definitions will be given in due course, at this point we remark that weakly mixing sets include *normal* sets, i.e. those sets for which any pattern of 0's and 1's appears in the characteristic sequence of the set with the same frequency as for a genuinely random set.

In [5], Fish characterised all the linear patterns which are guaranteed to appear in a weakly mixing set. We give a special (yet representative) case of this characterisation.

Theorem 1.3 (Fish [5])**.** *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a weakly mixing set. Suppose that $a_i, b_i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $c_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ for $i \in [r]$ are such that for all $i \neq j$ we have* $\det \begin{bmatrix} a_i & a_j \\ b_i & b_j \end{bmatrix} \neq 0$. *Then, there exist $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $a_i n + b_i m + c_i \in \mathcal{A}$ for all $i \in [r]$.*

For example, a set $\mathcal{A}$ will contain the pattern $n, m, n+m, n+2m, 2n+m$, which is not guaranteed to appear on the grounds of density alone. However, unlike in the case of the normal set, a weakly-mixing set is not guaranteed to contain two consecutive elements $n, n+1$. When it comes to polynomial patterns, one has a result of a somewhat different flavour, which bears resemblance to Theorem 1.2.

Theorem 1.4 (Fish [6])**.** *Let $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{N}$ be a weakly-mixing set, and let $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{N}$ be a set of positive density. Let $p_i(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ for $i \in [r]$ be polynomials of equal degree, such that for all $i \neq j$ we have $\deg(p_i - p_j) > 0$, and $p_i(n) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$. Then, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ except* [1] *for a set of density 0, there exist $m \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $p_1(n) - m, p_2(n) - m, \dots, p_r(n) - m \in \mathcal{A}$.*

[1]Here and elsewhere, when a statement is said to hold for "all N except for a set of 0 density ", we mean that there exists a set $S \subset \mathbb{N}$ with density 1 such that the statement holds for all $N \in S$. The meaning of the phrase "all but finitely many" is analogous.

In a previous paper, the author investigated the question of whether certain sets of polynomial recurrence are bases of positive integers. A representative instance is the following question.

Question 1.5. Fix $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ and a polynomial $p(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ with $p(n) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$. For $\varepsilon > 0$, let $\mathcal{A}$ be the Bohr set $\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid n\alpha \bmod 1 \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)\}$. Is it the case that for all $\varepsilon > 0$, the set $\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid p(n) \in \mathcal{A}\}$ is a basis of order 2 for the positive integers?

Here, a set $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{N}$ is a basis of order 2 if there exist $N_0 = N_0(\mathcal{B})$ such that for $N \geq N_0$, there are $n_1, n_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ with $N = n_1 + n_2$. Hence, we are asking if, for sufficiently large N, there is a solution to $N = n_1 + n_2$ with $p(n_1) \in \mathcal{A},\ p(n_2) \in \mathcal{A}$.

The answer to Question 1.5 is (trivially) negative in the case when $\deg p = 1$. Somewhat surprisingly, the answer remains negative when $\deg p = 2$ for generic choice of α. Finally, when $\deg p \geq 3$, the answer is positive, again for a generic choice of α. For exact statements, we refer to [10].

This paper arose from an attempt to see what happens at the other extreme, where instead of being structured, the set $\mathcal{A}$ is weakly-mixing.

When $\deg p = 1$, then it is not a significant loss of generality assume that $p(x) = x$. The question then becomes: Is any weakly-mixing set $\mathcal{A}$ a basis of order 2? The answer to this is negative, but $\mathcal{A}$ is *almost* a basis of order 2, in the sense $\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{A}$ has density 1 (see [5]). In the case when $\deg p \geq 2$, one cannot expect to guarantee that a weakly-mixing set $\mathcal{A}$ contains *any* elements from $\{p(n) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Indeed, if $\mathcal{A}$ is weakly-mixing, then so is $\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{Z}$ for any $\mathcal{Z}$ of density 0, and thus in particular $\mathcal{A} \setminus \{p(n) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is weakly mixing. However, we are able to prove the following.

Theorem 1.6. *Let $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{N}$ be a weakly-mixing set, and let $p(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ be a polynomial with $p(n) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$. Then, all N except for a set of 0 density can be represented as $N = n_1 + n_2$, where $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ are such that $p(n_1) + m \in \mathcal{A}$ and $p(n_2) + m \in \mathcal{A}$ for some $m \in \mathcal{A}$. Moreover, if $\deg p$ is odd then the conclusion holds for all but finitely many N.*

The above theorem is a direct consequence of two more technical results, which may be of independent interest. To formulate them, we need to introduce some terminology. For a polynomial p, we denote by $\deg p$ and $\operatorname{lc} p$ the degree and leading coefficient of p, respectively. We shall say that a sequence of polynomials $p_i^{(N)}(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ for $i \in [r],\ N \in \mathbb{N}$, is *uniformly admissible* if the following conditions hold:

(1) for each i and N, $\deg p_i^{(N)} > 0$, $\operatorname{lc} p_i^{(N)} > 0$, and moreover $\deg p_i^{(N)}$ and $\operatorname{lc} p_i^{(N)}$ are independent of N,

(2) for each $i \neq j$, $\deg(p_i^{(N)} - p_j^{(N)}) > 0$, and moreover $\deg(p_i^{(N)} - p_j^{(N)})$ and $\mathrm{lc}(p_i^{(N)} - p_j^{(N)})$ are independent of N.

For instance, the pair $p_1^{(N)}(n) = n^3,\ p_2^{(N)}(n) = (N-n)^3$ is uniformly admissible, but the pair $p_1^{(N)}(n) = n^2,\ p_2^{(N)}(n) = (N-n)^2$ is not. More generally, $p_1^{(N)}(n) = n^3,\ p_2^{(N)}(n) = an^3 + b(N)n^2 + c(N)n + d(N)$ will be uniformly admissible as long as $a \neq 0, 1$ or $a = 1$ and $b(N) = b$ is independent of N.

Theorem 1.7. *Let $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{N}$ be a weakly-mixing set, and let $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{N}$ be a set of positive density. Let $p_i^{(N)}(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ for $i \in [r], N \in \mathbb{N}$, be a family of polynomials which is* uniformly admissible. *Then, there exists N_0 such that for any $N > N_0$, there are $n \leq N$, $m \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $p_1^{(N)}(n) + m, \dots, p_r^{(N)}(n) + m \in \mathcal{A}$.*

Rather than fully general families of polynomials, we have are interested specifically in those which are themselves given by polynomial formulas. In other words, we will consider a sequence $p_i^{(N)}(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x, N]$, $i \in [r]$. Such sequence is *admissible* if the following holds:

(1) for each i, $\deg_x p_i^{(N)}(x) > 0$, and $p_i^{(N)}(x) \geq 0$ for $x \in [0, N]$,
(2) for each $i \neq j$, $\deg_x(p_i^{(N)}(x) - p_j^{(N)}(x)) > 0$.

For instance, the pair $p_1^{(N)}(n) = n^k,\ p_2^{(N)}(n) = (N-n)^k$ is admissible for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Theorem 1.8. *Let $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{N}$ be a weakly-mixing set, and let $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{N}$ be a set of positive density. Let $p_i^{(N)}(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x, N]$ for $i \in [r]$ be a polynomial family of polynomials, which is* admissible. *Then, there exists a set $S \subset \mathbb{N}$ with density $\mathrm{d}(S) = 1$, such that for all $N \in S$, there are $n \leq N$, $m \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $p_1^{(N)}(n)+m, \dots, p_r^{(N)}(n)+m \in \mathcal{A}$.*

This paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we give basic definitions, specifically we define the weakly-mixing sets. In Section 3 we reduce Theorem 1.7 to a uniform convergence statement in ergodic theory, and prove a special case of it. In Section 4 we introduce the PET induction and finish the proof of Theorem 1.7. In Section 5 we again reduce Theorem 1.8 to a statement about certain ergodic averages, and then prove this statement.

This paper draws heavily on the work of Bergelson [1] and Fish [5], [6]. Many of the ideas we use can be traced back to their, or earlier, work.

Acknowledgements. The author thanks Vitaly Bergelson for useful comments on Theorem 3.2, and Ben Green for advice and support during the work on this project. Thanks go also to Sean Eberhard, Freddie Manners, Rudi Mrazović, Przemek Mazur and Aled Walker for many informal discussions.

2. Definitions, convenitions and basics

Throughout the paper, we denote the characteristic function of a set X by 1_X. We use the convention $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$, and write $[N] = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$. To simplify notation, we use the symbol $\mathbb{E}$ borrowed from probability to denote averages: $\mathbb{E}_{x\in X} f(x) = \frac{1}{|X|}\sum_{x\in X} f(x)$.

For a set of integers $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{N}$ we define it density as $\mathrm{d}(\mathcal{A}) = \lim_{N\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{n\in[N]} 1_{\mathcal{A}}(n)$, provided that the limit exists, which will usually be the case in this paper.

We shall use standard asymptotic notation. We write $X = O(Y)$ or $X \ll Y$ if $X \leq CY$ for an absolute constant $C > 0$. If C is allowed to depend on a parameter M, we write $X = O_M(Y)$. In presence of a variable n, we write $X = o_{n\to\infty}(Y)$ (or simply $X = o(Y)$ if no confusion is possible) if $X/Y \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. If the rate of convergence is allowed to depend on M, we write $X = o_{M;n\to\infty}(Y)$.

A *measure preserving system* $\mathcal{X} = (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$ consists of a compact metrizable space X, together with a probability measure μ on a σ-algebra $\mathcal{B}$, and a $\mathcal{B}$-measurable transformation $T\colon X \to X$, such that $\mu(T^{-1}E) = \mu(E)$ for all $E \in \mathcal{B}$. The transformation T acts on function on X by composition: $(Tf)(x) = f(Tx)$.

Recall that a m.p.s. $\mathcal{X}$ is *ergodic* if for any $A, B \in \mathcal{B}$ we have that $\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N}\mu(A \cap T^{-n}B) \xrightarrow[N\to\infty]{} \mu(A \cap B)$, and similarly $\mathcal{X}$ is *weakly mixing* if we have the stronger condition $\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} |\mu(A \cap T^{-n}B) - \mu(A)\mu(B)| \xrightarrow[N\to\infty]{} 0$. A point $x \in X$ is *generic* if for any $f \in C(X)$ one has $\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} T^n f(x) \to \int f d\mu$. It is a consequence of the ergodic theorem that μ-almost all points are generic.

It will be convenient to view a set $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{N}$ of positive upper density as arising from dynamics. Let $\Omega := \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ denote the *shift space*, taken with the natural product topology and the Borel σ-algebra. On Ω, we may define the *shift map* given by $(Sx)(i) := x(i + 1)$. To $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{N}$ we can always associate its characteristic function $1_{\mathcal{A}} \in \Omega$, which gives rise the the *subshift* $X_{\mathcal{A}} := \mathrm{cl}\{S^n 1_{\mathcal{A}} \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, which is evidently a closed and S-invariant subspace of Ω.

The set $\mathcal{A}$ with positive upper density is *ergodic* if and only if the point $1_{\mathcal{A}} \in X_{\mathcal{A}}$ is generic for some ergodic S-invariant probability measure $\mu_{\mathcal{A}}$ (which is necessarily unique). We stress that an ergodic set $\mathcal{A}$ is in particular required to have positive upper density, and it is an easy consequence of the ergodic theorem that $\mathcal{A}$ in fact has a density. We denote the resulting measure preserving system $(X_{\mathcal{A}}, S, \mathcal{B}(X), \mu_{\mathcal{A}})$ by $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{A}}$. Finally, the set $\mathcal{A}$ is *weakly-mixing* if and only if it is ergodic and the system $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is weakly-mixing.

Another possible definition of a weakly-mixing set requires merely that $\mathcal{A}$ should take the form $\mathcal{A} = \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid f(T^n x_0) = 1\}$ where $\mathcal{X} = (X, T, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ is a weakly mixing system, $f \in L^\infty(\mu)$ takes values 0 and 1, and x_0 is *f-generic*. Here, a point

is f-generic if for any g in the algebra generated by $f, Tf, T^2f, \dots$, we have the convergence of the averages:

$$\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} g(T^n x_0) \xrightarrow[N\to\infty]{} \int_X g d\mu.$$

We claim that the two definitions are equivalent. Indeed, suppose that a set $\mathcal{A} = \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid f(T^n x_0) = 1\}$ is as in the latter definition. Define the measurable map $F\colon X \to \Omega$ given by $x \mapsto (f(T^n x))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. It is clear that $F\circ T = S\circ F$, and hence the pushforward $\nu := F_*\mu$ is a S-invariant measure on Ω. Since $\mathcal{Y} = (\Omega, S, \mathcal{B}(\Omega), \nu)$ is a factor of X, it is easy to check that $\mathcal{Y}$ is weakly mixing. Note also that $1_{\mathcal{A}} = F(x_0)$.

We need to check that $1_{\mathcal{A}}$ is generic for thus defined ν. It will suffice to verify that for any cylinder $U = \{x \in \Omega \mid x(1) = \epsilon_1, \dots, x(r) = \epsilon_r\}$ it is the case that $\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} 1_U(S^n 1_{\mathcal{A}}) \to \nu(U)$. But this is an easy consequence of f-genericity of x_0. Indeed, let $f_i(x) = f(x)$ if $\epsilon_i = 1$ and $f_i(x) = 1 - f(x)$ if $\epsilon_i = 0$; then

$$\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} 1_U(S^n 1_{\mathcal{A}}) = \mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} \prod_{i\leq r} f_i(T^{n+i} x_0) \xrightarrow[N\to\infty]{} \int_X \prod_{i\leq r} T^n f_i = \nu(U).$$

3. Uniform ergodic theorem

We will now explain how Theorem 1.7 can be derived from a result in ergodic theory, concerning convergence of certain averages. Because the set $\mathcal{A}$ is already related to a m.p.s. $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{A}} = (X_{\mathcal{A}}, S, \mu_{\mathcal{A}})$, it comes as no surprise that we will be interested in averages of functions for this system.

Fix a family of polynomials $p_i^{(N)}$, $i \in [r]$ as in Theorem 1.7 or 1.8, and assume for simplicity that $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A}$. For large integers M, N, let $\mathcal{N}(N, M)$ denote the number of solutions to

$$p_1^{(N)}(n) + m \in \mathcal{A}, \quad \dots, \quad p_r^{(N)}(n) + m \in \mathcal{A}, \quad m \in \mathcal{A} \tag{3.1}$$

with $n \in [N]$, $m \in [M]$. Let also $f_0 \in C(X_{\mathcal{A}})$ be the function given by $f_0(x) = x(1)$. We may then approximate, at least heuristically:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{NM}\mathcal{N}(N, M) &= \mathbb{E}_{m\leq M}\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} 1_{\mathcal{A}}(m) \prod_{i=1}^{r} 1_{\mathcal{A}}(p_i^{(N)}(n) + m) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{m\leq M}\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} f_0(S^m) \prod_{i=1}^{r} S^{p_i^{(N)}(n)+m} f_0(1_{\mathcal{A}}) \\
&\overset{(1)}{\approx} \int_{X_{\mathcal{A}}} f_0 \cdot \mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} \prod_{i=1}^{r} S^{p_i^{(N)}(n)} f_0 \, \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathcal{A}} \overset{(2)}{\approx} \left(\int_{X_{\mathcal{A}}} f_0(x) \, \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathcal{A}}\right)^{r+1} = \mathrm{d}(\mathcal{A})^{r+1}
\end{aligned}$$

The approximation labelled (1) is simply the ergodic theorem, and is valid as long as M is sufficiently large, with N fixed. The key difficulty lies in making precise and justifying step (2), which will involve understanding the convergence of averages such as the one under the integral.

Study of similar averages was pioneered by Bergelson in [1], but without the dependence of the polynomials on N. We shall call a sequence of $r \geq 1$ polynomials $(p_i)_{i=1}^r$ *admissible* if for any $i \neq j$ we have $\deg(p_i - p_j) > 0$, and $p_i(n) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$.

Theorem 3.1 (Bergelson [1])**.** *Suppose that a m.p.s $\mathcal{X} = (X, T, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ is weakly mixing. Let $(p_i)_{i=1}^r$ be an admissible sequence of polynomials. Let $f_i \in L^\infty(\mu)$. Then:*

$$\mathbb{E}_{n \leq N} \prod_{i=1}^r T^{p_i(n)} f_i \xrightarrow[N\to\infty]{L^2} \prod_{i=1}^r \int f_i d\mu. \tag{3.2}$$

Here, we need a slight variation of the above theorem, already mentioned in the introduction. Refining the notion of admissibility, we shall call a family of sequences of polynomials $(p_i^{(t)})_{i=1}^r$ *uniformly admissible* if for any $i \neq j$: $\deg(p_i^{(t)} - p_j^{(t)}) \geq 0$ and if the leading term and degree of $p_i^{(t)} - p_j^{(t)}$ are independent of t. (Here, t runs over some unspecified index set I.) For example, the family $(x^2 + a_1^{(t)}, x^2 + x + a_2^{(t)})$ is uniformly admissible, but $(x^2 + b_1^{(t)} x + a_1^{(t)}, x^2 + x + a_2^{(t)})$ is, in general, not (unless $b_1^{(t)}$ is independent of t).

Theorem 3.2. *Suppose that a m.p.s $\mathcal{X} = (X, T, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ is weakly mixing. Let $(p_i^{(t)})_{i=1}^r$ be an admissible family of sequences of polynomials, indexed by $t \in I$. Let $f_i \in L^\infty(\mu)$. Then:*

$$\mathbb{E}_{n \leq N} \prod_{i=1}^r T^{p_i^{(t)}(n)} f_i \xrightarrow[N\to\infty]{L^2} \prod_{i=1}^r \int f_i d\mu, \quad \textit{uniformly in } t. \tag{3.3}$$

Before embarking upon the proof of the above theorem, we explain how it completes the proof of the first of our main results.

Proof of Theorem 1.6 assuming Theorem 3.2. Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that the system

$$p_1^{(N)}(n) + m \in \mathcal{A}, \quad \ldots, \quad p_r^{(N)}(n) + m \in \mathcal{A}, \quad m \in \mathcal{B}, \tag{3.4}$$

has no solution, and consider the quantity

$$\mathcal{L}(N) = \left| \lim_{M\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{m \leq M} \mathbb{E}_{n \leq N} 1_{\mathcal{B}}(m) \left(\prod_{i=1}^r 1_{\mathcal{A}}(m + p_i^{(N)}(n)) - \mathrm{d}(\mathcal{A})^r \right) \right|$$

which can be construed as the (normalised) deviation of the number solutions to (3.4) from the expected value of $\mathrm{d}(\mathcal{B})\mathrm{d}(\mathcal{A})^r MN$. On one hand, since (3.4) lacks solutions, we have $\mathcal{L}(N) = \mathrm{d}(\mathcal{B})\mathrm{d}(\mathcal{A})^r$, and in particular the limit actually exists. On the other hand, we may approximate, with the use of Cauchy-Schwartz and the

ergodic theorem:

$$\mathcal{L}(N) \leq \lim_{M\to\infty} \left(\mathbb{E}_{m\leq M} \left(\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} \prod_{i=1}^{r} 1_{\mathcal{A}}(m + p_i^{(N)}(n)) - \mathrm{d}(\mathcal{A})^r \right)^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

$$= \left(\int_{X_{\mathcal{A}}} \left(\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} \prod_{i=1}^{r} S^{p_i^{(N)}(n)} f_0 - \mathrm{d}(\mathcal{A})^r \right)^2 d\mu_{\mathcal{A}} \right)^{1/2} = \left\| \mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} \prod_{i=1}^{r} S^{p_i^{(N)}(n)} f_0 - \mathrm{d}(\mathcal{A})^r \right\|_{L^2(\mu)}$$

An application of Theorem 3.2 gives, in particular:

$$\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} \prod_{i=1}^{r} S^{p_i^{(N)}(n)} f_0 \xrightarrow[N\to\infty]{L^2} \mathrm{d}(\mathcal{A})^r.$$

Thus, if N is large enough, then we conclude that $\mathcal{L}(N) < \mathrm{d}(\mathcal{B})\mathrm{d}(\mathcal{A})^r$, which is the sought for contradiction. □

Remark 3.3. In the case $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}$, a similar reasoning gives the asymptotic formula for the the number of solutions $\mathcal{N}(N, M)$ mentioned at the beginning of this section:

$$\mathcal{N}(N, M) = \mathrm{d}(\mathcal{B})\mathrm{d}(\mathcal{A})^r MN(1 + o_{N\to\infty}(1) + o_{N;M\to\infty}(1)).$$

The remainder of this section is devoted to proving Theorem 3.2. In our argument, we follow the approach of Bergelson rather closely, taking care to account for uniformity of convergence. We will need an uniform version of van der Corput Lemma, which is a slight variation on the usual statement. We include the proof, which is rather standard, in the appendix, for the convenience of the reader.

Lemma 3.4 (Uniform van der Corput)**.** *Suppose that $(u_n^{(t)})_n$ is a sequence of vectors in a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ with $\left\|u_n^{(t)}\right\| \leq 1$, indexed by $t \in I$. Suppose further that for $s_h^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ we have:*

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} \left\langle u_n^{(t)},\ u_{n+h}^{(t)} \right\rangle \right| \leq s_h^{(t)} + o_{N\to\infty}(1) \tag{3.5}$$

where the error term is uniform in t. Suppose further that:

$$\mathbb{E}_{h\leq H} s_h^{(t)} \xrightarrow[H\to\infty]{} 0, \quad \textit{uniformly in } t. \tag{3.6}$$

Then we have:

$$\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} u_n^{(t)} \xrightarrow[N\to\infty]{} 0, \quad \textit{uniformly in } t. \tag{3.7}$$

Proof of Theorem 3.2, linear case. We will now deal with the case of Theorem 3.2 when $\deg p_i^{(t)} = 1$ for all i. For the sake of readability, we will keep dependence on t implicit, writing p_i instead of $p_i^{(t)}$. In this case, p_i are necessarily of the form $p_i(x) = a_i n + b_i^{(t)}$, where a_i does not depend on t.

We may assume without loss of generality that for each i, we have $\int f_i d\mu = 0$. Indeed, if this is not the case, we may simply replace the original functions by $\tilde{f}_i := f_i - \int f_i d\mu$. Likewise, we may assume $\|f\|_\infty \leq 1$, else we may rescale.

The case $r = 1$ when there is only one polynomial is simple. Indeed, we then have:

$$\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} T^{p_1(n)} f_1 = T^{b_i^{(t)}} \left(\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} T^{a_1 n} f_1\right).$$

The average in the brackets does not depend on t, and converges to 0 in L^2 which follows e.g. from Theorem 3.1. Since $T^{b_i^{(t)}}$ preserves the L^2 norm, we have:

$$\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} T^{p_1(n)} f_1 \xrightarrow[N\to\infty]{L^2} 0, \text{ uniformly in } t.$$

For $r \geq 2$ we proceed by induction using van der Corput Lemma. Let us write $u_n := \prod_{i=1}^r T^{p_i(n)} f_i$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} \langle u_n,\ u_{n+h}\rangle &= \int \prod_{i=1}^r T^{a_i n + b_i} \left(f_i \cdot T^{a_i h} f_i\right) d\mu \\ &= \int \tilde{f}_{r,h} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} T^{\tilde{a}_i n + \tilde{b}_i} \tilde{f}_{i,h} d\mu\end{aligned}$$

where we define:

$$\tilde{a}_i := a_i - a_r, \quad \tilde{b}_i := b_i - b_r, \quad \tilde{f}_{i,h} = f_i \cdot T^{a_i h} f_i.$$

The sequence of polynomials $\tilde{p}_i(x) = \tilde{a}_i x + \tilde{b}_i$ for $i \in [r-1]$ is uniformly admissible, since $\tilde{p}_i - \tilde{p}_j = p_i - p_j$. Hence, we can invoke the inductive assumption to conclude that:

$$\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} T^{\tilde{a}_i n + \tilde{b}_i} \tilde{f}_{i,h} = \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} \int \tilde{f}_{i,h} d\mu + o_{h;N\to\infty}(1),$$

with the error term independent of t. Letting $s_h = \left|\prod_{i=1}^r \int \tilde{f}_{i,h} d\mu\right|$ we have:

$$|\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} \langle u_n,\ u_{n+h}\rangle| \leq s_h + o_{h;N\to\infty}(1).$$

By a standard argument, we have $\mathbb{E}_{h\leq H} s_h \to 0$ as $H \to \infty$, and convergence is automatically uniform in t, since s_h does not depend on t. We are now in position to apply Lemma 3.4 to conclude that $\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} u_n \to 0$ in L^2 as $N \to \infty$, uniformly in t. This finishes the inductive step, and thus the proof in the case $\deg p_i = 1$.

□

4. PET induction

To prove the general case of Theorem 3.2 we will use PET induction. Because the idea will reemerge in the proof of Theorem 5.1, we will introduce the key concepts in separation from the proof of this particular result.

Definition 4.1 (Characteristic vector)**.** Let $p = (p_i)_{i=1}^r$ be the a sequence of polynomials (not necessarily admissible). For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let F_k be the set of those p_i with $\deg p_i = k$. We define the *characteristic vector* of p, which we denote by $\chi(p)$, by declaring $\chi(p)_k$ to be equal to the number of different leading coefficients $\mathrm{lc}(p)$ for $p \in F_k$.

It does not matter much if we define characteristic vectors to have entries for all k or just for $k \leq \max_i \deg p_i$. For the sake of simplicity, we assume the former. We make the set of possible characteristic vectors (i.e. $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$-valued sequences) into an ordered set by introducing reverse-lexicographical order. Recall that $\chi > \chi'$ if for the largest k with $\chi_k \neq \chi'_k$ we have $\chi_k > \chi'_k$. It is well known fact that $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is well-ordeder by the reverse lexicographical order. Thus, any decreasing sequence $\chi > \chi' > \chi'' > \dots$ has to be finite.

For the inductive step, we shall need the following operation. Let $p = (p_i)_{i=1}^r$ be the an admissible sequence of polynomials. We may, without loss of generality, assume that $\deg p_1 \geq \deg p_2 \geq \cdots \geq \deg p_r$. We then define the sequence $\tilde{p}_h$ to the concatenation of two sequences:

$$\tilde{p}_{1,h,i}(x) := p_i(x) - p_r(x), \qquad i \in [r-1] \tag{4.1}$$

$$\tilde{p}_{2,h,i}(x) := p_i(x+h) - p_r(x), \qquad i \in [r] \tag{4.2}$$

The following statements give a base for the PET induction. We cite it here merely as a list of facts. For proofs, which are not difficult, we refer the reader to [1]

Fact 4.2. Let p be an admissible sequence of polynomials.

(1) If $\chi(p)_1 = 0$, then $\tilde{p}_h$ is admissible for all but finitely many h.
(2) The characteristic vector $\chi(\tilde{p}_h)$ takes the same value for all but finitely many values of h.
(3) We have $\chi(\tilde{p}_h) < \chi(p)$.

Essentially the same statement if true with admissible sequences replaced by a uniformly admissible families of sequences of polynomials.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $p^{(t)}$ be an uniformly admissible sequence of polynomials.*

(1) *The characteristic vector $\chi(p^{(t)})$ does not depend on t.*
(2) *For all but finitely many h, the leading terms of $\tilde{p}^{(t)}_{h,k}$ and $\tilde{p}^{(t)}_{h,k} - \tilde{p}^{(t)}_{h,l}$ do not depend on t.*
(3) *For all but finitely many h, $\chi(\tilde{p}^{(t)}_h)$ does not depend on h and t, and we have $\chi(\tilde{p}^{(t)}_h) < \chi(p^{(t)})$.*
(4) *If $\chi(p^{(t)})_1 \leq 1$ then for all but finitely many h, $p^{(t)}_h$ is uniformly admissible.*
(5) *If $\chi(p^{(t)})_1 \geq 2$ the for all but finitely many h, we have for any $(\sigma, i) \neq (\rho, j)$ that $\deg(\tilde{p}^{(t)}_{h,\sigma,i} - \tilde{p}^{(t)}_{h,\rho,j}) \geq 1$, except when $i = j$ and $\deg p^{(t)}_i = 1$.*

Proof. The item 1 is clear, since $\chi(p^{(t)})$ depends only on leading terms of polynomials in $p^{(t)}$, and these are independent of t.

For item 2, we first deal leading terms of polynomials in $\tilde{p}_h^{(t)}$. These are either of the form $p_i^{(t)}(x)-p_r^{(t)}(x)$, or of the form $p_i^{(t)}(x)-p_r^{(t)}(x)$. In the former case, the leading term does not depend on t by assumption. In the latter case, we reduce to the former unless $\deg p_i^{(t)} = \deg p_r^{(t)}$ and $\operatorname{lc} p_i^{(t)} = \operatorname{lc} p_r^{(t)}$. When this happens, we can write $p_i^{(t)}(x) = ax^d + b_1^{(t)}x^{d-1} + q_1^{(t)}(x)$ and $p_r^{(t)}(x) = ax^d + b_2^{(t)}x^{d-1} + q_2^{(t)}(x)$, where a and $b := b_1 - b_2$ are independent of t. It follows that $p_i^{(t)}(x+h)-p_r^{(t)}(x) = dah+b$, except for at most one value of h, when this is 0.

Secondly, we deal with leading terms of differences. They are of the form $p_i(x+\sigma h) - p_j(x+\rho h)$ with $\sigma, \rho \in \{0,1\}$. In the case when $\rho = 0$, we use essentially the same argument as before. The case $\rho = 1, \sigma = 0$ follows by the same argument as the case $\rho = 0, \sigma = 1$. Finally, the case $\rho = 1, \sigma = 1$ follows from the case $\rho = 0, \sigma = 0$ by a change of variable.

For item 3, we notice that the argument in 2 shows that $\chi(\tilde{p}_h^{(t)})_k = \chi(p^{(t)})_k$ for all $k > \deg p_r$. It will suffice to check that for $k = \deg p_r$ we have $\chi(\tilde{p}_h^{(t)})_k < \chi(p^{(t)})_k$. This follows, because each $p_i^{(t)}$ with $\deg p_i^{(t)} = \deg p_r^{(t)}$ condtibutes 1 to $\chi(\tilde{p}_h^{(t)})_k$, except for $p_r^{(t)}$ itself.

For items 4 and 5, we notice that the only condition that remains to be checked to verify that $\tilde{p}_h^{(t)}$ are uniformly admissible for almost all h is that the differences $p_{h,\sigma,i}^{(t)}(x) - p_{h,\rho,j}^{(t)}(x)$ should be non-constant. The only possible degrees of such difference are $\deg(p_i^{(t)} - p_j^{(t)})$ (if the leading terms differ or $\sigma = \rho$), or $\deg p_i^{(t)} - 1$ (otherwise). In the former case, we have $\deg(p_i^{(t)} - p_j^{(t)}) > 0$ by assumption. In the latter case, we have $\deg p_i^{(t)} - 1 > 0$, unless $\deg p_i^{(t)} = 1$. □

With this machinery, we are ready to complete the proof.

Proof of Theorem 3.2, general case. For a characteristic vector χ, let $\Phi(\chi)$ denote the statement that Theorem 3.2 holds for all p with $\chi(p) \leq \chi$. We shall show that $\Phi(\chi)$ holds, provided that $\Phi(\chi')$ holds for all $\chi' < \chi$. Because of well ordering, this will finish the proof. We have already dealt with all $\chi < (0,1,0,\cdots)$.

Take any $\chi \geq (0,1,0,\cdots)$, any uniformly admissible $p^{(t)} = (p_i^{(t)})_{i=1}^r$ with $\chi(p^{(t)}) = \chi$, and let $f_i \in L^\infty(X)$. As before, we may assume that $\int f_i d\mu = 0$ and $\|f_i\|_\infty \leq 1$ for all i. We need to show that:

$$\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} \prod_{i=1}^r T^{p_i^{(t)}(n)} f_i \xrightarrow[N\to\infty]{L^2} 0, \quad \text{uniformly in } t.$$

Let $u_n := \prod_{i=1}^{r} T^{p_i^{(t)}(n)} f_i$. Bearing in mind that we hope to apply van der Corput Lemma, we compute:

$$\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} \langle u_n,\ u_{n+h}\rangle = \mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} \int \prod_{i=1}^{r} T^{p_i^{(t)}(n)} f_i \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{r} T^{p_i^{(t)}(n+h)} f_i d\mu \tag{4.3}$$

$$= \int f_r \mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{r-1} T^{\tilde{p}_{1,h,i}^{(t)}(n)} f_i \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{r} T^{\tilde{p}_{2,i,h}^{(t)}(n)} f_i \right) d\mu \tag{4.4}$$

with $\tilde{p}_{1,h,i}$ and $\tilde{p}_{2,h,i}$ defined as in (4.1) and (4.2). Except for finitely many values of h, we have $\chi(\tilde{p}_h) < \chi(p)$.

We now need to branch out into two cases. Suppose first that $\chi(p^{(t)})_1 = 0$. Then, $\tilde{p}_h^{(t)}$ is uniformly admissible, so by the inductive assumption $\Phi(\chi(\tilde{p}_h))$ we may write:

$$\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{r-1} T^{\tilde{p}_{1,h,i}^{(t)}(n)} f_i \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{r} T^{\tilde{p}_{2,i,h}^{(t)}(n)} f_i \right) = o_{h;N\to\infty}(1). \tag{4.5}$$

The decay rate implicit in the o-notation is independent of t. Hence, the assumptions of van der Corput Lemma 3.4 are satisfied with $s_h = 0$ for all but finitely many h. Application of the lemma gives precisely the sought convergence.

Secondly, suppose that $\chi(p^{(t)})_1 \neq 0$. In this case, let s denote the number of linear polynomials among $p_i^{(t)}$, and let $r' = r - s + 1$. We will adapt the argument from the linear case. If the linear polynomials in $p^{(t)}$ are given by $p_i^{(t)}(x) = a_i(x) + b_i^{(t)}$ then the expression under the integral in (4.4) becomes:

$$\tilde{f}_r \cdot \mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{r'} T^{\tilde{p}_{1,h,i}^{(t)}(n)} f_i \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{r'} T^{\tilde{p}_{2,i,h}^{(t)}(n)} f_i \right) \cdot \prod_{i=r'+1}^{r-1} T^{\tilde{a}_i n + \tilde{b}_i^{(t)}} \tilde{f}_{i,h},$$

where $\tilde{a}_i = a_i - a_r$, $b_i^{(t)} = b_i^{(t)} - b_r^{(t)}$ and $\tilde{f}_{i,h} = f_i \cdot T^{a_i h} f_i$. We may now apply the inductive assumption to the uniformly admissible sequence $\tilde{p}_h'^{(t)}$, which is the concatenation of $(\tilde{p}_{h,0,i}(x))_{i\in[r']}$, $(\tilde{p}_{h,1,i})_{i\in[r']}$ and $(\tilde{a}_i x + \tilde{b}_i^{(t)})_{i\in(r',r]}$. Note that the $\chi(\tilde{p}_h'^{(t)}) < \chi(\tilde{p}_h^{(t)}) < \chi(\tilde{p})$ and that $r' > 0$ because $\chi(>)(0,1,0,\dots)$. Thus, we recover the bound from 4.5, and the rest of the argument proceeds in the same way.

□

5. Doubly polynomial averages

We now deal with polynomial families of polynomials, such as the ones which appear in Theorem 1.8. Our first step is — again — to translate the problem into a question about uniform convergence of certain polynomial averages.

The main result of this section is the following uniform convergence theorem for "doubly polynomial" averages. The notion of admissibility of such sequences is defined in the introduction.

Theorem 5.1. *Suppose that a m.p.s $\mathcal{X} = (X, T, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ is weakly mixing. Let $(p_i^{(t)})_{i=1}^r$ be an admissible family of polynomial sequences of polynomials. Let $f_i \in L^\infty(\mu)$. Then there exists a set $S \subset \mathbb{N}$ with density $\mathrm{d}(S) = 1$ and:*

$$\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} \prod_{i=1}^{r} T^{p_i^{(t)}(n)} f_i \xrightarrow[N\to\infty]{L^2} \prod_{i=1}^{r} \int f_i d\mu, \quad \text{uniformly in } t \in S. \tag{5.1}$$

Proof of Theorem 1.8 assuming Theorem 5.1. Direct repetition of the proof of Theorem 1.7 from Section 3. □

The proof of Theorem 5.1 will require several simple lemmas.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\{S_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of sets $S_n \subset \mathbb{N}$ with density 1. Then there exists a single set $S \subset \mathbb{N}$ with density 1 such that for each n, $S_n \setminus S$ is finite.*

Proof. We may assume without loss of generality that the family S_n is descending, else way may replace S_n by $\bigcap_{m\leq n} S_n$.

We shall define S by declaring that $k \in S$ if and only if $k \in S_{n(t)}$ where $n(k)$ is an increasing function yet to be determined. If $n(k) \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$, then clearly $S \setminus S_n$ is finite for any n.

It remains to check that if $n(t)$ increases sufficiently slowly, then S has density 1. This is a simple consequence of the fact that for each n, S_n has density 1. □

Lemma 5.3. *Let $(a_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence with $a_n \in [0, 1]$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

1. *We have convergence $\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} a_n \xrightarrow[N\to\infty]{} 0$.*
2. *There exists $J \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $\mathrm{d}(J) = 1$ such that $a_n \xrightarrow[n\to\infty, n\in J]{} 0$.*

Proof. See [4, Chpt 2.7] □

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Throughout the proof, $f_i \in L^\infty(X)$ are arbitrary functions. We may assume as usual that $\int f_i d\mu = 0$ and $\|f_i\|_\infty \leq 1$. We will also occasionally keep dependence on t explicit, writing p_i in place of $p_i^{(t)}$.

Case $r = 1, \deg p_1 = 1$. If $r = 1, \deg p_1 = 1$ then we need to prove the convergence:

$$\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} T^{p_1^{(t)}(n)} f \xrightarrow[N\to\infty]{L^2} 0, \quad \text{uniformly in } t \in S,$$

with $p_1^{(t)}(n) = a(t)n + b(t)$. Since $T^{b(t)}$ is an isometry of L^2, we may assume without loss of generality that $b(t) = 0$.

By the spectral theorem, we can find a probability measure $\nu = \nu_f$ on $\mathbb{T}$ such that:

$$\left\| \mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} T^{p_1^{(t)}(n)} f \right\|^2 = \left\| \mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} e\left(p(n)\alpha\right) \right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{T},\nu)} = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left| \mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} e\left(a(t)n\alpha\right) \right|^2 d\nu(\alpha),$$

where as usual $e(\alpha) = e^{2\pi i \alpha}$. It is a well-known fact that since $\mathcal{X}$ is weakly mixing, the measure ν has no atoms.

We have the elementary inequality $|1 - e(\alpha)| \geq 4 \|\alpha\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}$. Thus, if for some $\delta > 0$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{T}$ we have $\|a\alpha\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \geq \delta$ then:

$$\mathbb{E}_{n \leq N} e\left(an\alpha\right) = \left| \frac{1 - e(aN\alpha)}{N(1 - e(a\alpha))} \right|^2 \ll \frac{1}{(N\delta)^2} \tag{5.2}$$

where the implied constant is absolute (and equal to $\frac{1}{4}$).

Let us denote by $\Gamma_{a,\delta}$ the set of $\alpha \in \mathbb{T}$ for which we have inequality $\|a\alpha\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} < \delta$. Using (5.2) for $\alpha \notin \Gamma_{a,\delta}$ and the trivial bound for $\alpha \in \Gamma_{\alpha,\delta}$ we find:

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} \left|\mathbb{E}_{n \leq N} e\left(an\alpha\right)\right|^2 d\nu(\alpha) \leq \nu\left(\Gamma_{a,\delta}\right) + \frac{O(1)}{(N\delta)^2}.$$

We claim that there exists a set $S \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $\mathrm{d}(S) = 1$ such that:

$$\nu\left(\Gamma_{a(t),\delta}\right) \xrightarrow[\delta \to 0]{} 0, \quad \text{uniformly in } t \in S. \tag{5.3}$$

Suppose that the claim has been established. We then have:

$$\left\| \mathbb{E}_{n \leq N} T^{p_1^{(t)}(n)} f \right\|^2 = o_{\delta \to 0}(1) + o_{\delta; N \to \infty}(1) = o_{N \to \infty}(1),$$

with decay rates uniform in $t \in S$. This finishes the proof of the theorem. Hence, it remains to find S with (5.3). Our construction relies on the following observation.

Observation 5.4. Given δ, there exists a set S_δ with density 1 such that

$$\left|\nu\left(\Gamma_{a(t),\delta}\right) - \lambda\left(\Gamma_{a(t),\delta}\right)\right| \xrightarrow[t \to \infty,\ t \in S_\delta]{} 0, \tag{5.4}$$

where λ denotes that Lebesgue measure.

Proof. Because of the Lemma 5.3, it will suffice to prove that for fixed $\delta > 0$ we have:

$$\mathbb{E}_{t \leq T} \left(\nu\left(\Gamma_{a(t),\delta}\right) - \lambda\left(\Gamma_{a(t),\delta}\right)\right)^2 \xrightarrow[T \to \infty]{} 0,$$

This will follow once we show that:

$$\mathbb{E}_{t \leq T} \nu\left(\Gamma_{a(t),\delta}\right) \xrightarrow[T \to \infty]{} \lambda\left(\Gamma_{a(t),\delta}\right), \qquad \mathbb{E}_{t \leq T} \nu\left(\Gamma_{a(t),\delta}\right)^2 \xrightarrow[T \to \infty]{} \lambda\left(\Gamma_{a(t),\delta}\right)^2.$$

For the first limit, we can rewrite:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{t \leq T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \nu\left(\Gamma_{a(t),\delta}\right) &= \lim_{T \to \infty} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \mathbb{E}_{t \leq T} \chi_\delta(a(t)\alpha) d\nu(\alpha) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} \lim_{T \to \infty} \mathbb{E}_{t \leq T} \chi_\delta(a(t)\alpha) d\nu(\alpha), \end{aligned}$$

where χ_δ denotes the characteristic function of the interval $(-\delta, \delta)$ mod 1, and the interchange of limit and the integral is justified by the dominated convergence theorem.

For $\alpha \notin \mathbb{Q}$, since χ_δ is Riemann-integrable and $\alpha a(t)$ is polynomial with irrational coefficients, we have by a classical theorem of Weyl that:

$$\lim_{T\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{t\leq T}\chi_\delta(a(t)\alpha) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \chi_\delta(\alpha)d\lambda = \lambda(\Gamma_{a(t),\delta}).$$

As for $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}$, we know that ν has no atoms so $\nu(\mathbb{Q}) = 0$. It follows that:

$$\lim_{T\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{t\leq T}\nu\left(\Gamma_{a(t),\delta}\right) = \lambda(\Gamma_{a(t),\delta}).$$

For the second limit, we can proceed analogously. We first rewrite:

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{T\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{t\leq T}\nu\left(\Gamma_{a(t),\delta}\right)^2 &= \lim_{T\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{T}\times\mathbb{T}} \mathbb{E}_{t\leq T}\chi_\delta(a(t)\alpha)\cdot\chi_\delta(a(t)\beta)d\nu(\alpha)d\nu(\beta)\\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}\times\mathbb{T}} \lim_{T\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{t\leq T}(\chi_\delta\times\chi_\delta)(a(t)\alpha,\ a(t)\beta)d(\nu\times\nu)(\alpha,\beta).\end{aligned}$$

The set of $(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathbb{T}\times\mathbb{T}$ which are linearly dependent over $\mathbb{Q}$ has $\nu\times\nu$ measure 0, since it is a union of countably many 0-measure sets $\{(\alpha,\beta)\mid k\alpha+l\beta+m=0\}$, $k,l,m\in\mathbb{Z}$.

If (α,β) are $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly independent, then by Weyl's theorem, the sequence $(a(t)\alpha,\ a(t)\beta)$ is equidistributed. It follows that:

$$\lim_{T\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{t\leq T}(\chi_\delta\times\chi_\delta)(a(t)\alpha,\ a(t)\beta) = \int_{\mathbb{T}\times\mathbb{T}} (\chi_\delta\times\chi_\delta)d(\lambda\times\lambda).$$

As a consequence, we have the sought convergence:

$$\lim_{T\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{t\leq T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\nu\left(\Gamma_{a(t),\delta}\right) = \left(\Gamma_{a(t),\delta}\right)^2.$$

This finishes the proof. □

We are now ready to finish the proof of the theorem. Let S_δ be the sets constructed in the above Observation 5.4. Let S be a set with $\mathrm{d}(S)=1$ and $S\setminus S_\delta$ finite for each $\delta\in\mathbb{Q}$. We then have for $t\in S$:

$$\nu\left(\Gamma_{a(t),\delta}\right) = \lambda\left(\Gamma_{a(t),\delta}\right) + o_{\delta;t\to\infty}(1).$$

We need to show that for any $\varepsilon>0$ one can find $\delta(\varepsilon)$ such that for $\delta<\delta(\varepsilon)$ and any $t\in S$ we have

$$\nu\left(\Gamma_{a(t),\delta}\right) < \varepsilon. \tag{5.5}$$

Let δ_0 be such that $\lambda\left(\Gamma_{a(t),\delta_0}\right)<\varepsilon/2$. We can then find t_0 such that for $t>t_0$, $t\in S$ we have $\nu\left(\Gamma_{a(t),\delta_1}\right)<\varepsilon/2+\varepsilon/2=\varepsilon$. Since $\nu\left(\Gamma_{a(t),\delta}\right)$ is decreasing in δ, the bound (5.5) holds for any $\delta<\delta_0$, and $t>t_0,\ t\in S$.

On the other hand, for each $t\leq t_0$, because $\bigcap_{\delta>0}\Gamma_{a(t),\delta}$ is a finite set and ν is atomless, there is some $\delta_t>0$ such that (5.5) holds for $\delta<\delta_t$.

Taking $\delta(\varepsilon)=\min_t\delta_t$ with t running over $[t_0]\cup\{0\}$ we find that (5.5) holds for all $\delta<\delta(\varepsilon)$. This finishes the proof of the claim.

Case $r \geq 2, \deg p_1 = 1$.

We proceed by induction on r, the case $r = 1$ having been considered. The sequence $p^{(t)}$ takes the form $p^{(t)}(n)_i = a_i(t)n + b_i(t)$ where $a(t)_i$ and $b_i(t)$ are polynomials and $a_i \neq a_j$ for $i \neq j$. We take $u_n := \prod_{i=1}^{r} T^{p_i(n)} f_i$, and much as before we find:

$$\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} \langle u_n,\ u_{n+h}\rangle = \int \tilde{f}_{r,h} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} T^{\tilde{a}_i(t)n+\tilde{b}_i(t)} \tilde{f}_{i,h} d\mu,$$

where we define:

$$\tilde{a}_i := a_i - a_r, \quad \tilde{b}_i := b_i - b_r, \quad \tilde{f}_{i,h}^{(t)} = f_i \cdot T^{a_i(t)h} f_i.$$

By inductive claim, we find a set S_0 with density 1 such that:

$$\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} T^{\tilde{a}_i n+\tilde{b}_i} \tilde{f}_{i,h} = \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} \int \tilde{f}_{i,h} d\mu + o_{h;N\to\infty}(1)$$

with error term uniform in $t \in S_0$. Hence, we have:

$$\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} \langle u_n,\ u_{n+h}\rangle = s_h^{(t)} + o_{h;N\to\infty}(1), \qquad s_h^{(t)} = \prod_{i=1}^{r} \int \tilde{f}_{i,h} d\mu.$$

Let $s_{h,i}^{(t)} := \int \tilde{f}_{i,h} d\mu$, so that $s_h^{(t)} = \prod_{i=1}^{r} s_{h,i}^{(t)}$. Note that $s_{h,i}^{(t)} \in [0,1]$.

We have already seen that there is a set $S_1 \subset S_0$ with density 1 such that we have:

$$\mathbb{E}_{h\leq H} s_{h,i}^{(t)} \xrightarrow[H\to\infty]{} 0, \quad \text{uniformly in } t \in S_1.$$

Since $s_h^{(t)} \leq s_{h,i}^{(t)}$, we also similar convergence for averages of $s_h^{(t)}$. Thus, we may apply van der Corput Lemma, which finishes the inductive step.

General case.

As before, it will suffice to deduce truth of the claim for $p^{(t)}$ from the truth of the claim for sequences with smaller characteristic vector.

Take arbitrary $p_i^{(t)}$ with $\chi(p^{(t)}) = \chi(N) \geq (0,1,0,\cdots)$. We need to find a set S with density $\mathrm{d}(S) = 1$ such that (5.1) is satisfied.

Let $u_n := \prod_{i=1}^{r} T^{p_i^{(t)}(n)} f_i$. With the same computation as before, we find that:

$$\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} \langle u_n,\ u_{n+h}\rangle = \int f_r \mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{2r-1} T^{\tilde{p}_{h,i}^{(t)}(n)} \tilde{f}_i \right) d\mu$$

with $\tilde{f}_i = f_i$ and $\tilde{f}_{i+r-1} = \tilde{f}_i$.

If $\chi(p^{(t)})_1 \neq 0$ and hence $\tilde{p}_h^{(t)}$ is not guaranteed to be admissible, then we may replace $\tilde{p}_h^{(t)}$ with $\tilde{p}_h'^{(t)}$, constructed as in the proof of Theorem 3.2. Note that $\chi(\tilde{p}_h'^{(t)}) < \chi(p^{(t)})$ and that $\tilde{p}_h'^{(t)}$ is admissible. To avoid overly complicated notation we shall suppose that $\chi(p^{(t)})_1 = 0$; the argument can easily be adapted.

For all but finitely many h we may apply the inductive assumption to $\tilde{p}_h^{(t)}$ to conclude that:

$$\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N}\left(\prod_{i=1}^{2r-1} T^{\tilde{p}_{h,i}^{(t)}(n)}\tilde{f}_i\right) \xrightarrow[N\to\infty]{L^2} 0, \quad \text{uniformly in } t\in S_h. \tag{5.6}$$

Let us call a pair (h,t) *exceptional* if the sequence $\tilde{p}_h^{(t)}$ is not admissible, and let $s_h^{(t)} := 1$ if (h,t) is exceptional and $s_h^{(t)} = 0$ otherwise. Note that convergence in (5.6), without the uniformity assumption, holds for a set value of t unless the pair (h,t) is exceptional.

By Observation 5.4, we can find a set S with density $\mathrm{d}(S) = 1$ and $S\setminus S_h$ finite for all h. Also, let S_h' be the set of those t with $t\in S$ and (t,h) not exceptional. Because S_h and S_h' differ only by finitely many terms, the convergence in (5.6) holds uniformly $t\in S_h'$. This allows us to bound:

$$|\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N}\langle u_n,\ u_{n+h}\rangle| \leq s_h^{(t)} + o_{h;N\to\infty}(1), \tag{5.7}$$

where the error term is independent of t.

Given t, the number of h such that (h,t) is exceptional can be bounded by a constant, independent of t. Thus, we have:

$$\mathbb{E}_{h\leq H} s_h^{(t)} = \frac{O(1)}{H} = o_{H\to\infty}(1),$$

with error term independent of $t\in S$. Consequently, van der Corput Lemma can be applied, yielding the sought convergence. □

Appendix A.

Proof of Lemma 3.4. For fixed H we have:

$$\left\|\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N}\mathbb{E}_{h\leq H} u_{n+h}^{(t)}\right\|^2 = \left\|\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} u_n^{(t)}\right\|^2 + O\left(1/N\right).$$

By Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we can bound:

$$\left\|\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N}\mathbb{E}_{h\leq H} u_{n+h}^{(t)}\right\|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}_{h,h'\leq H}\left|\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N}\left\langle u_{n+h}^{(t)},\ u_{n+h'}^{(t)}\right\rangle\right|.$$

For each summand above we have the bound:

$$\left|\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N}\left\langle u_{n+h}^{(t)},\ u_{n+h'}^{(t)}\right\rangle\right| = \left|\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N}\left\langle u_n^{(t)},\ u_{n+|h-h'|}^{(t)}\right\rangle\right| + o_{H;N\to\infty}(1) \leq s_h^{(t)} + o(1).$$

It follows that:

$$\left\|\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N} u_n^{(t)}\right\|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}_{h,h'\leq H} s_{|h-h'|}^{(t)} + o_{H;N\to\infty}(1)$$

Summing by parts gives:

$$\mathbb{E}_{h,h'\leq H} s_{|h-h'|}^{(t)} \leq \mathbb{E}_{h\leq H}\frac{h}{H}\mathbb{E}_{h'\leq h} s_h^{(t)} + o_{H\to\infty}(1).$$

Let $K \leq H$ be arbitrary. Splitting the above average into $h \leq K$ and $K < h \leq H$ gives:

$$\mathbb{E}_{h\leq H}\frac{h}{H}\mathbb{E}_{h'\leq h}s_h^{(t)} \leq \frac{K}{H} + \max_{K<h\leq H} s_h^{(t)} = o_{K;H\to\infty}(1) + o_{K\to\infty}(1).$$

It follows that:

$$\left\|\mathbb{E}_{n\leq N}u_n^{(t)}\right\|^2 = o_{H;N\to\infty}(1) + o_{K;H\to\infty}(1) + o_{K\to\infty}(1).$$

which implies the sought convergence. □

References

[1] V. Bergelson. Weakly mixing PET. *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems*, 7(03):337–349, 1987.

[2] V. Bergelson and A. Leibman. Polynomial extensions of van der Waeden's and Szemeredi's theorem. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 9(0):725.753, 1996.

[3] V. Bergelson, A. Leibman, and E. Lesigne. Intersective polynomials and polynomial Szemeredi theorem. *Advances in Mathematics*, 219(0):1–21, Sept. 2007.

[4] M. Einsiedler and T. Ward. Ergodic Theory - with a view towards Number Theory, 2010.

[5] A. Fish. Solvability of linear equations within weak mixing sets. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 184(1):30, Apr. 2007.

[6] A. Fish. Polynomial largeness of sumsets and totally ergodic sets. *Online Journal of Analytic Combinatorics*, 5:1–19, 2010.

[7] H. Furstenberg. Ergodic behavior of diagonal measures and a theorem of Szemerédi on arithmetic progressions. *Journal d'Analyse Mathématique*, 31(1):204–256, Dec. 1977.

[8] H. Furstenberg. *Recurrence in Ergodic Theory and Combinatorial Number Theory*. Princeton University Press, 1981.

[9] H. Furstenberg and Y. Katznelson. An ergodic Szemeredi theorem for commuting transformations, 1978.

[10] J. Konieczny. Sets of recurrence as bases for the positive integers. pages 1–32, 2010.

[11] A. Sárközy. On difference sets of sequences of integers. I. *Acta Mathematica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 31(1-2):125–149, Mar. 1978.

[12] E. Szemerédi. On sets of integers containing no four elements in arithmetic progression. *Acta Mathematica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 20(1-2):89–104, 1969.

Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford, Andrew Wiles Building, Radcliffe Observatory Quarter, Woodstock Road, Oxford, OX2 6GG

E-mail address: jakub.konieczny@gmail.com